

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/462,179	PEDUTO ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Marc A Patterson	1772	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Marc A Patterson.

(3) _____.

(2) Roger Lee RL

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 2/19/04

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: all of the record

Identification of prior art discussed: all of the record

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: _____.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Applicant's representative proposed amending Claim 1 to recite that the claimed external layer is the outermost layer of the claimed structure. Examiner stated that such amendment would likely distinguish the claimed invention from Kerschbaumer. Examiner agreed to consider such amendment at this stage of prosecution.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Marc Patterson
Examiner's signature, if required